

Remarks

Claims 1-31 were submitted for examination. The claims have not been amended.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

Claims 1-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith et al (Hereinafter, "Smith"), U.S. Pat. No. 6,697,842. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

CLAIM 1

Smith at least fails to teach "receiving at least one information item separate from the first plurality of information items," "forming a second plurality of information items including the first plurality of information items and the at least one information item" and "processing the second plurality of information items, providing at least one dynamically processed information item" as recited in Claim 1.

The Office Action dated March 7, 2006 asserts that the specification does not explicitly describe nor is sufficiently clear for one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize the steps as recited in claims 1, 16 and 29 such as "receiving at least one information item separate from the first plurality of information items."

The specification defines information items as follows:

Information Items: Data that may comprise news, weather, email, activities, events, including exceptions, etc. potentially of interest to one or more users. Information items may also comprise queries posed to one or more users and information regarding a user's use of the service (i.e. what information was viewed, in what order was it viewed, etc.). US 2005/0060365 A1, Paragraph [0022]

And further:

Information items herein are distinct from raw data packets commonly used to transport information payloads, in that information items possess semantic significance independent of the data stream in which they are embedded. Information items may be addressed to a specific user, such as an email sent directly to a particular user, or they may be more general, such as a news item. Information items may be machine generated, such as a book recommendation based on browsing or buying habits of a particular user, or may be created by a living user, such as an email message. Information items may be generated or derived by devices participating in the service, including the local device on which the processing is occurring. For example, the service may generate driving directions for a user after observing a calendar appointment on the user's calendar that occurs at a location to which the user has not yet traveled. US 2005/0060365 A1, Paragraph [0033]

Further, the specification describes:

Upon receiving information items, a device may, for example, act by formatting and presenting some portion of the information to a user. The receiving device may further process the information items, resulting in a modified presentation to the user or transfer to another device. US 2005/0060365 A1, Paragraph [0028]

Further, the specification describes:

Groups of information items may either be homogeneous or heterogeneous. A homogeneous plurality of information items is a plurality of information items wherein all items are of the same semantic type, even if they are syntactically different. For example, a group of email messages are homogeneous, even though some may be simple text-encoded files and some may be HTML-encoded. A heterogeneous plurality of information items is a plurality of information items wherein the items have a variety of semantic types, although they may be encoded in a similar syntax. For example, email messages and news items may both be encoded as text files, a similar syntax. Since they are semantically different, however, together they form a heterogeneous plurality of information items.

Information items may be transferred from one device to another heterogeneously, which means that the order of transfer of information items is not dependent on semantic category (e.g., email, calendar, to-do list, etc.) of an information item. In a heterogeneous transfer, the categories of information items transferred may be interleaved, so that, for instance, an information item pertaining to a calendar listing may be transferred from a source device to a receiving device, followed by transferring an information item for a to-do list from the source device to the receiving device, followed by an email information item, etc.

Dynamic processing is an ability of a service to change the inclusion or exclusion of information items to be transferred or being transferred and, if required,

associated priority order assignments. Dynamic processing typically occurs as a result of: a change in context (e.g., cancellation of a scheduled meeting), new information received, user input, change in network connectivity (e.g. degrading wireless signal, or transitioning from cellular phone data packet network to a local wireless Ethernet connection), the passage of time, or other factors prompting the service to re-evaluate the established set of information items for transfer (e.g, reevaluation of inclusion and prioritization). In discussions that follow, any of the aforementioned changes in context may generate new context that is utilized by the context-based processing system. Dynamic processing may occur any time during the transfer of information items. Inclusion and prioritization of information items may be determined by an external agent or entity and the externally processed results passed back for use by the service. Although repeated reprocessing may take place, the process is still called dynamic processing. US 2005/0060365 A1, Paragraphs [0057] – [0059]

Smith does not disclose receiving an information item separate from the first plurality of information items. Thus, Smith cannot also disclose forming a second plurality of information items including the first plurality of information items and the at least one information item. Further, Smith does not disclose processing the second plurality of information items, providing at least one dynamically processed information item.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Smith fails to teach the limitations of Claim 1. The rejection of Claim 1 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn.

Claims 2-14 depend from allowable Claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason.

CLAIM 15

Smith at least fails to teach “receiving at least one information item separate from the first plurality of information items” and “forming a second plurality of information items including the first plurality of information items and the at least one information item” as recited in Claim 15.

Claim 15 was rejected on similar grounds as Claim 1. As illustrated above with respect to Claim 1, Smith simply fails to disclose every aspect of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Smith fails to teach the limitations of Claim 15. The rejection of Claim 15 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 16-28 depend from allowable Claim 15 and are allowable for at least this reason.

CLAIM 29

Smith at least fails to teach “a second unit, connected to the first unit, to receive at least one information item separate from the first plurality of information items” and “a third unit, connected to the second unit, to form a second plurality of information items including the first plurality of information items and the at least one information item” as recited in Claim 29.

Claim 29 was rejected on similar grounds as Claim 1. As illustrated above with respect to Claim 1, Smith simply fails to disclose every aspect of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Smith fails to teach the limitations of Claim 29. The rejection of Claim 29 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 30-31 depend from allowable Claim 29 and are allowable for at least this reason.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and indication of allowance by the Examiner is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, he or she is requested to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number shown below as soon as possible. If any fee insufficiency or overpayment is found, please charge any insufficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Date: May 4, 2006 /Rita M. Wisor/ Reg. No. 41,382

Rita M. Wisor
Reg. No. 41,382

Attorney Phone Number: (512) 732-3923

Correspondence Address: Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026